| 1 | Wendy M. Krincek, Esq. | | | |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | Nevada Bar No. 6417 | | | |
| 3 | Ethan D. Thomas, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12874 | | | |
| | Andrew S. Clark, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14854 | | | |
| 4 | LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. | | | |
| 5 | 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 300 | | | |
| 6 | Las Vegas, Nevada 89169.5937 Telephone: 702.862.7709 Fax No.: 702.862.8150 | | | |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | wkrincek@littler.com edthomas@littler.com | | | |
| | asclark@littler.com | | | |
| 9 | Attorneys for Defendant | | | |
| 10 | CITY OF HENDERSON | | | |
| 11 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | |
| 12 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | | |
| 13 | | | | |
| 14 | KEVIN LAPEER and LAUREN LAPEER, | Case No. 2:24-cv-00332-GMN-EJY | | |
| 15 | Plaintiffs, | STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] | | |
| | v. | ORDER TO REMAND TO STATE COURT AND TO EXTEND TIME TO | | |
| 16 | CITY OF HENDERSON, HECTOR VILLA, | RESPOND TO FIRST AMENDED | | |
| 17 | DOE Defendants 1 through 20, and ROE Defendants 1 through 10, | COMPLAINT | | |
| 18 | ٥ | [FIRST REQUEST] | | |
| 19 | Defendants. | | | |
| 20 | | | | |
| 21 | Defendants, the City of Henderson and | Hector Villa, and Plaintiffs, Kevin Lapeer and | | |
| 22 | Lauren Lapeer, through their counsel, hereby agree and stipulate to remand this case to Eight | | | |
| 23 | | To that end, the parties stipulate and agree as | | |
| | · | To that end, the parties supulate and agree as | | |
| 24 | follows: | | | |
| 25 | 1. On December 6, 2023, Plaintiffs Kevin and Lauren LaPeer filed their Complaint i | | | |
| 26 | the Eighth Judicial District Court for Clark County, Nevada, asserting six causes of action against | | | |
| 27 | the City of Henderson, Henderson Police Department, Thedrick Andres, and Anthony Branchir | | | |
| 28 | (collectively the "City Defendants"), and Officer Hector Villa. | | | |

| 1 | 2. The LaPeers' fifth claim sought relief against the City Defendants under | 42 U.S.C. | |
|----|--|-------------|--|
| 2 | § 1983. | | |
| 3 | 3. On February 16, 2024, the City of Henderson removed the case to this C | ourt under | |
| 4 | 28 U.S.C. § 1331, based on the LaPeers' § 1983 claim, which arose under the laws of the United | | |
| 5 | States. | | |
| 6 | 4. The City Defendants moved to dismiss the LaPeers' § 1983 claim on Fe | bruary 23, | |
| 7 | 2024 (ECF No. 8). | | |
| 8 | 5. On August 1, 2024, the Court dismissed the LaPeers' § 1983 claim wit | h leave to | |
| 9 | amend (ECF No. 40). | | |
| 10 | 6. On August 22, 2024, the LaPeers filed their First Amended Complaint | (ECF No. | |
| 11 | 44). | | |
| 12 | 7. The LaPeers did not re-allege their § 1983 claim in the First Amended | Complaint | |
| 13 | (see generally ECF No. 44). Nor did the LaPeers allege any other claim arising under the | | |
| 14 | Constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Thus, there remains n | | |
| 15 | basis for federal-question jurisdiction in this Court. | | |
| 16 | 8. Neither is there a basis for subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § | 1332(a) at | |
| 17 | this time, as the parties are not citizens of different states. | | |
| 18 | 9. Accordingly, the parties stipulate and agree that remand is appropriate an | nd consent | |
| 19 | to this Court's order remanding the case to the Eighth Judicial District Court for Clark County | | |
| 20 | Nevada. | | |
| 21 | In order to efficiently facilitate the proceedings in this case pending remand to the Eight | | |
| 22 | Judicial District Court, the parties further stipulate and agree as follows: | | |
| 23 | 10. Should the Court grant the parties' stipulation to remand and remand this | case to the | |
| 24 | Eighth Judicial District Court, the deadline for all Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs' Fire | | |
| 25 | Amended Complaint shall be extended up to and including twenty-one days from the date that | | |
| 26 | notice of entry of this Court's order remanding the action is filed in the Eighth Judicial Distric | | |
| 27 | Court. | | |
| 28 | 11. Should the Court deny the parties' stipulation to remand this case to t | he Eighth | |

Case 2:24-cv-00332-GMN-EJY Document 48 Filed 09/04/24 Page 3 of 3

| 1 | Judicial District Court and thereby retain subject matter jurisdiction, the deadline for all Defendants | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2 | to respond to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint shall be extended up to and including twenty- | | |
| 3 | one days from the entry of such order. | | |
| 4 | 12. This is the first request for an extension of time for Defendants to respond to | | |
| 5 | Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint and is requested in good faith and not for purposes of delay. | | |
| 6 | D + 1 G + 1 + 4 2024 | D + 1 G + 1 + 2004 | |
| 7 | Dated: September 4, 2024 | Dated: September 4, 2024 | |
| 8 | SGRO & ROGER | LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | By: /s/ Alanna Bondy Anthony Sgro, Esq. | By: <u>/s/ Andrew S. Clark</u> Wendy M. Krincek, Esq. | |
| 11 | Alanna Bondy, Esq. Han G. Lee, Esq. | Ethan D. Thomas, Esq. Andrew S. Clark, Esq. | |
| 12 | | Attorneys for Defendant | |
| 13 | Attorneys for Plaintiffs KEVIN LAPEER and LAUREN LAPEER | CITY OF HENDERSON | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | Dated: September 4, 2024 | | |
| 16 | WILSON ELSER | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | By: /s/ Sheri Thome Sheri Thome, Esq. | | |
| 19 | Attorneys for Defendant | | |
| 20 | HECTOR VILLA | | |
| 21 | | ORDER | |
| 22 | IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 23 | both ECF No. 47 Stip for an Extension of Time and ECF No. 45 Mtn to | NA L | |
| 2425 | Remand. are DENIED as moot. | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 26 | | DATED: September 4, 2024 | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | 4876-8601-3919.1 / 080828-1032 | | |

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. Attorneys At Law 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 300 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5937 702.862.8800